

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ANTHONY CROSS,)	3:13-cv-00433-MMD-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	September 14, 2015
)	
RON JAEGER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	
_____)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is Plaintiff's Motion Requesting Defendant to Produce the Recording of the Disciplinary Hearing as Plaintiff's Exhibit "L" in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 221.)

As noted in the motion, Plaintiff previously sought production of his Disciplinary Hearing Recording (ECF No. 73). Defendant submitted a limited opposition to the production because "Plaintiff[had] failed to identify any pending motion that he wants to use the exhibit for." Defendant continued on to state that the Defendant would not object to producing the "audio CD" if Plaintiff could identify a specific motion to which the recording would apply. (ECF No. 83.)

The court agreed with Defendant's analysis. Because there was no motion or other matter pending for which the recording would be relevant, and because the court clerk cannot act as a general repository for documents, the court denied Plaintiff's motion. (ECF No. 103.)

Plaintiff's pending motion states he now requests the submission of the recording to substantiate his motion for summary judgment. He requests Defendant to produce the recording as Plaintiff's Exhibit L.

